



Msc. Mirsad Kuteli

The love and hatred in Shakespeare's "Romeo and Juliet" play

Love may be stronger than death

Abstract

Love between two young people and animosity between the two families are themes that run through all the drama.

Violence and death in '*Romeo and Juliet*' are always associated with passion, whether that passion is love or hate.

"Romeo and Juliet" is a play of high artistic value, depicting sentimental love with serious implications till the scarification of its protagonists.

It seems somewhat weird the contrast between the family hatred and passionate love between two young people. Given that the ideal love hardly exists yet, tragedy protagonists are satirically seen by young readers. However, true love will survive, no matter how high the life obstacles can be for young people to pass through.

In the course of the play, the young lovers tend to challenge their entire social world and their families as well. Here it is reflected their innocence, who create the cult of love, making it more powerful than death. Consequently, only through death, they can save their love, and their love is so deep that they are willing to end their lives in its defense. The depth of love takes extraordinary proportions sometimes goes so far as to blasphemy.

Introduction

The event takes place in Verona. Consequently, setting the scene of the drama in this place has been the target of critics against Shakespeare for alleged plagiarism. However, Shakespeare argued the opposite, offering us not only this world drama, but also many others which remain emblem in the history of art in general and literature in particular. *'Romeo and Juliet'* is already the most famous love story of human beings around the globe. Of course, love is the dominant and the most important topic in the play, since it focuses on romantic love, especially in the passion inciting Romeo and Juliet to what is called love at first sight.

The brawl caused in the streets of Verona ends with murder between two families, Montague and Capulets.

The event fray even more when Romeo (Montague's son) sneaks disguised at the Capulet's house to attend the ball, where he suddenly falls in love with a girl

named Juliet (Capulet's daughter). That night, Romeo sneaks to the Capulets orchard and overhears his girlfriend vowing her love to him. Then the lovers talk to each other and secretly decide to get married the next day and they make it through the support of Friar Laurence. While Romeo was returning home, ran across a fight between his friends and Tybalt, grandson of Mrs. Capulet, who slays Mercutio, Romeo's friend, while in revenge Romeo slays Tybalt, as its consequence, the Prince exiles Romeo from Verona.

On the other hand, Capulet' decides to marry his daughter to the Count Paris. But Juliet does not wish marry Count Paris, and seeks help from Frair Laurence, who offers her a drug that will put her into a deathlike coma temporarily. But unfortunately, Romeo hears the news of the death of Juliet, before he received the letter from Frair Laurence, where was written and prepared the whole event by the Frair to avoid marriage with the Count Paris. Hence, Romeo despaired visits the grave of his girlfriend and ends tragically as the end of his life love.

Romeo, who had taken poison to drink it by the grave of Juliet, he encounters Paris, who has come to put flowers on his fiancée tomb. Paris confronts Romeo, and during the fight, Romeo kills Paris, then Romeo recounts all the love and drinks the poison. Romeo dies just before Juliet awakes.

Later on, when Juliet wakes up and realizes that Romeo was poisoned for incomparable love he had for her, she kisses Romeo, and stabs herself with his dagger. Finally, the drama ends tragically, where love leads to death of two teenagers.

The tragedy of fate

The action of *Romeo and Juliet* occurs between two speeches proclaiming the lovers' deaths - the prologue's forecast of events and the prince's closing summary. The vicissitudes of desire take place in this unusual period, after life yet

before death. At the same time, this temporal setting has a range of interpretative implications.

With the lovers' deaths announced from the start, audience attention is directed to the events' fateful course. The question is less what happens than how it happens. By framing the action in this way, the prologue triggers various generic and narrative effects. First, it establishes the play as 'a tragedy of fate' similar to Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*, which gives 'the audience a superior knowledge of the story from the outset, reducing the hero's role to bring into prominence the complex patterns of action'. In turn, this generic marker initiates a compelling narrative, poised between prolepsis and analepsis, as opening portents of death are played off against background details and further intimations.¹

Romeo and Juliet, although a tragedy written early in Shakespeare's career, persists in being a problematic play while it continues to command our modern sympathies in spanning the socio-historical changes wrought over the passage of some four hundred years since the play first captured "two hours' traffic of our stage".ⁱⁱ

This tragedy's captivating story and its compelling presentation of romance, beauty, and powerful passions for good and ill have made it one of Shakespeare's most familiar dramas. But familiarity should not be allowed to breed complacency.ⁱⁱⁱ

In mid-century, writer Charles Gildon and philosopher Lord Kames argued that the play was a failure in that it did not follow the classical rules of drama: the tragedy must occur because of some [character flaw](#), not an accident of fate. Writer and critic Samuel Johnson, however, considered it one of Shakespeare's "most pleasing" plays.

In the later part of the 18th and through the 19th century, criticism centred on debates over the moral message of the play. Actor and playwright [David Garrick](#)'s 1748 adaptation excluded Rosaline: Romeo abandoning her for Juliet was seen as fickle and reckless. Critics such as Charles Dibdin argued that Rosaline had been purposely included in the play to show how reckless the hero was, and that this was the reason for his tragic end. Others argued that Friar Laurence might be Shakespeare's spokesman in his warnings against undue haste. With the advent of the 20th century, these moral arguments were disputed by critics such as [Richard Green Moulton](#): he argued that accident, and not some character flaw, led to the lovers' deaths.

Conclusion

The love is violent at the '*Romeo and Juliet*' play. It goes into blindness and is extremely uncontrolled. The passion to each other and their innocence carry them against the whole world, and even sometimes against themselves. This may seem obvious, perhaps even justifiable considering their very young age.

The play '*Romeo and Juliet*' does not make a specific moral statement about the relationships between love and society, religion and family, rather, it portrays the chaos and passion of being in love, combining images of love, violence, death, religion and family in an impressive incentive leads to a tragic conclusion of the play.

In drama, love emerges as an amoral issue, leading to more destruction than happiness. But in its extreme passion, the love that Romeo and Juliet experience also appears as beautiful as few would want, or be able, to resist its power. However, they were so unlucky almost from the start, when strife begins between their families to the awakening of Juliet after Romeo had committed suicide. Through fate enigma, perhaps Shakespeare got mysticism, which always makes us curious and incites our imagination.

Shakespeare often intermingle refinements that can rarely be used by ordinary writers. Yet he used to do that in every work. Even in this drama, insert of the poison originally thought to be non-lethal, however, results in death of the youth. Regarding this effect, perhaps he may have hinted at the society's intent to poison good things, like the feud between the Montague and Capulet tribes that poisoned their offspring's love.

The author looks at some of the ways in which this play has been made accessible, as a romantic story of young love, or a colourful and spectacular historical pageant and suggests that they lead away from the Elizabethan play-text. It should be possible to propose some thoughts about the play as a "tragedy" which

will take us beyond both Aristotle's poetics and the popular notion of the play as the teenager's experience of heartbreak.^{iv}

Romeo and Juliet is sometimes considered to have no unifying theme, save that of young love.^v *Romeo and Juliet* have become emblematic of young lovers and doomed love. Since it is such an obvious subject of the play, several scholars have explored the language and historical context behind the romance of the play.^{vi}

Later in the play, Shakespeare removes the more daring allusions to Christ's resurrection.^{vii} Therefore, in the final suicide scene, there is a contradiction in the message—in the Catholic religion, suicides were often thought to be condemned to hell, whereas people who die to be with their loves under the 'Religion of Love' are joined with their loves in paradise. *Romeo and Juliet's* love seems to be expressing the "Religion of Love" view rather than the Catholic view. Another point is that although their love is passionate, it is only consummated in marriage, which prevents them from losing the audience's sympathy.^{viii}

The Catholic understanding of sexual desire, and its need to be ruled by reason, is on display in *Romeo and Juliet*, argues Pearce. The play is not a paean to romance but a cautionary tale about the naivete and folly of youthful infatuation and the disastrous consequences of poor parenting. Although such a reading of *Romeo and Juliet* is countercultural in an age that glorifies the heedless and headless heart of young love, Pearce makes his case through a meticulous engagement with Shakespeare and his age and with the text of the play itself.^{ix}

While some claim this tragedy is experimental, the degree to which Shakespeare reigns remarkably innovative might be underestimated. If not the first romantic tragedy for the English stage, *Romeo and Juliet* is at least the earliest and greatest example of this genre from the prolific period of Renaissance drama.^x

Critics no longer debate whether this play is a tragedy, but rather what kind of a tragedy it is and wherein excellent for its kind, debate often turning on Shakespeare's degree of success in integrating the tragic claims of fate and free will.^{xi}

Scholars are divided on the role of fate in the play. No consensus exists on whether the characters are truly fated to die together or whether the events take place by a series of unlucky chances. Arguments in favour of fate often refer to the description of the lovers as "star-cross'd". This phrase seems to hint that the stars have predetermined the lovers' future.^{xii}

“In the tragedies with Christian settings Shakespeare’s mimesis as imitation or representation of humanity in situations of suffering, failure, and death concentrates mainly on his heroes’ and/or heroines’ relationships in “nature and nations”. Shakespeare as a Renaissance dramatist is particularly concerned with the neutral perspective of the individual; he evokes our sympathy by allowing us to participate in the heroes’ human experiences instead of giving us advice on how to be correct lovers, tolerant nephews, sons, daughters, mother and/or fathers, sensible spouses, acceptable citizens, or successful kings”.^{xiii}

The tragedies with Christian settings are directly concerned with moral, psychological, social, and political ideas but not with the use of such theological categories as sin, salvation, repentance, grace, and the providence of God – then they, in some instances, imply a questioning of parts of Christian orthodoxy as can be seen in Romeo and Juliet by its emphasis on classical concepts of fate and fortune.^{xiv}

Still, other scholars see the play as a series of unlucky chances—many to such a degree that they do not see it as a tragedy at all, but an emotional melodrama.^{xv}

Bibliography

- ⁱ Davis, Lloyd. *Desire and Presence in Romeo and Juliet* Volume 49: *Romeo and Juliet* and its Afterlife, 1996
- ⁱⁱ Gibbons, Brian. *New Arden Shakespeare*, London: Methuen, 1980
- ⁱⁱⁱ Joan Ozark Holmer. *Myself Condemned and Myself Excus'd*: Tragic Effects in "Romeo and Juliet" , University of North Carolina Press, 1991, p. 345-362
- ^{iv} Holderness, Graham. *Shakespeare's "Romeo and Juliet"*, Amazon. 1991
- ^v Bowling, Lawrence E. "The Thematic Framework of *Romeo and Juliet*." *PMLA* 64 1949, p. 208
- ^{vi} Honegger, Thomas. *Journal of historical pragmatics*, 2006, p.168
- ^{vii} Groves, Beatrice, *Texts and Traditions: Religion in Shakespeare, 1592-1604*. Oxford University Press. England 2007, p. 61
- ^{viii} Paul N. Siegel, "Christianity and the Religion of Love in *Romeo and Juliet*" 1961, , p, 371-392
- ^{ix} Pearce, [Joseph](#). *Shakespeare on love: seeing the Catholic presence in Romeo and Juliet*, Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 2013, p.371-392
- ^x Joan Ozark Holmer. *Myself Condemned and Myself Excus'd*: Tragic Effects in "Romeo and Juliet" , University of North Carolina Press, 1991, p. 345
- ^{xi} Paul N. Siegel, "Christianity and the Religion of Love in *Romeo and Juliet*" 1961, p. 371.
- ^{xii} Evans, Bertrand, *Fate as practicer: Romeo and Juliet*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1950, p.22-51
- ^{xiii} Waters, Douglas D. *Christian Settings in Shakespeare's Tragedies*. Associated University Presses, London, 1994, p.247
- ^{xiv} Waters, Douglas D. *Christian Settings in Shakespeare's Tragedies*. Associated University Presses, London, 1994, p.258
- ^{xv} John W. Draper, "The Date of *Romeo and Juliet*." *The Review of English Studies* ,Jan 1949, p.55-57